

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/629,547**

Applicant(s)  
**Takahashi et al.**

Examiner  
**Vinh Luong**

Group Art Unit  
**3682**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vinh Luong

(3) Todd Burns

(2) Richard Schwaab

(4) Yoji Ito & Taro Kashima

Date of Interview 11/9/99

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 16 and 31.

Identification of prior art discussed:

N/A.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Applicant explained, inter alia, that: (1) the portion 4b has no critical function, it is cited in the original claim 1 to define the free space next to the flywheel; (2) the case law such as Ball, Clement or Richman supports the position that to determine the recapture rule the claim in reissue application should be interpreted as a whole; (3) the merit of each case is dependent on its own facts; (4) the Memorandum regarding the Recapture Rule of the Office on September 21, 1999 supports the conclusion that applicant's claims are not recaptured claims as seen in the section "Reissue Claims Are Broader in Some Aspects, But Narrower in Others" on page 4 of the Memo; (5) there have been no cases that overrule the earlier case law of CCPA and CAFC; (6) applicant believes that the present facts are very close to earlier cases, e.g., Richman case; (7) M.P.E.P. 1412.02 also controls; (8) there is no mechanical stop in the instant flywheel; and (9) the added claim amendments are directed to the same prior art rejection made in the original patent.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

  
VINH LUONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3682

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.